

REMARKS

The office action of June 4, 2003, has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1, 3 and 5 through 14 remain in this case.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaya, et. al in view of Guheen, et. al.

Shaya, et. al, is a US patent application published on October 31, 2002, and filed on October 17, 2001, claiming benefit of a provisional application filed October 18, 2000. As such, the effective date of the reference is, at the earliest, the provisional filing date of October 18, 2000.

Applicants do not believe that the Shaya reference is relevant, for the reasons given in the response filed March 13, 2003, the telephone interview with the Examiner on July 16, 2003, and the Request for Reconsideration filed the same day. However, in order to place this application in condition for allowance, with this response Applicants are supplying a Declaration of Prior Invention under 37 CFR 1.131, which shows that the invention in this application was reduced to practice at least as early as August, 2000, which is several months prior to the effective date of the Shaya, et al, reference. With the rejection over Shaya now moot and removed from consideration, Applicants believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over Guheen standing alone, for the reasons given in the responses and request for reconsideration previously filed.

Guheen presents a description of a product comparison system in its discussion of figure 66 (column 174), among many other applications of a method for conveying redundancies and omissions among components of a network framework. The description is very general, and mentions that "features may be listed" and "data, i.e. specifications, details, etc., relating to the products and services are displayed along with a comparison between different products and services." (col. 174, lines 26-29) The flowchart of figure 66 is no more detailed, and just indicates that data relating to user requirements are received, and recommendations are output based on the data. It is not explained what method is used to generate the display, other than that

data and comparisons are provided - nothing would teach or suggest the combination of snippets and generic text into natural language fluent text.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of the claims, are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
David Caldwell, Michael White and Tanya Korelsky

By: 
Michael F. Brown, Reg. No. 29,619
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: brown@bpmlegal.com
Dated: September 4, 2003